

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 20 remain in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1 – 3, 6, 9, 14 and 17 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 USC §112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

“The meaning of every term used in any of the claims **should be apparent** from the descriptive portion of the specification with clear disclosure as to its import;” MPEP §608.01(o) (emphasis added). Moreover,

While an applicant is not limited to the nomenclature used in the application as filed, he or she should make appropriate amendment of the specification whenever this nomenclature is **departed from by amendment** of the claims so as to have clear support or antecedent basis in the specification for the new terms appearing in the claims.

Id (emphasis added). “The subject matter of the claim **need not be** described **literally** (i.e., using the same terms or *in haec verba*) in order for the disclosure to satisfy the description requirement.” MPEP §2163.02.

With regard to claims 1 and 9, the Office Action asserts that the specification “does not expressly, implicitly, or inherently support that visual cue objects or visual feedback are inserted into the file” in memory. Office Action, #5, page 3.

As previously noted, the present application indicates using a “standard **document viewing** application, such as Adobe Acrobat Exchange, Microsoft Word or others, is used with plug in enhancements to **display a document** to be printed and visual feedback cues associated with user selected print job parameters.” Abstract, page 10 and paragraph 0005. Two things are very apparent from this. First, the document viewing application is a desktop publishing type application, such as are commonly referred to as a WYSIWYG. Second, these application *display* a representation of what the printed document will look like, not the original document file.

In word processing and desktop publishing applications, WYSIWYG

means that **the display simulates the appearance** and precisely represents the effect of **fonts and line breaks** on the **final pagination** using a **specific printer configuration**, so that a citation on page 1 of a 500-page document can accurately refer to a reference three hundred pages later.

...

Before the adoption of WYSIWYG techniques, text appeared in editors using the system standard typeface and style with little indication of layout (margins, spacing, et cetera). Users were required to enter special non-printing control codes (now referred to as markup code tags) to indicate that some text should be in boldface, italics, or a different typeface or size.

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WYSWYG (emphasis added). So, it is well known that the original document is a text document with embedded mark-up commands. Thus, opening a Word file with Word or Notepad, for example, produces two very different displays from the same original document.

So, inserting visual feedback into an original Word file, for example, involves inserting mark-up commands into the file. Moreover, it is well known that editing the Word file begins by loading the file into memory. Editing changes the original file in memory. Those changes are made to the stored Word file only when the file is stored. Losing power during an editing session, for example, prior to saving and without the Word back-up feature enabled, loses all changes/edits from the session. Even with back-up enabled, edits to a recovered file are not applied until that recovered file is stored. Therefore, the statement that “the plug-ins of the present invention insert visual feedback directly into the source document,” (application, paragraph 0014) requires inserting that visual feedback into the file in memory for subsequently storing it. *See, e.g.*, claim 2. Therefore, it is apparent that the specification supports “inserting visual feedback into the file in memory” and claims 1 and 9.

With regard to claims 5 and 13, the Office Action asserts that the specification “fails to describe inserting or removing visual cue objects from a file.” Office Action, #6, page 3.

When executing with a document viewing application program as described above, **the plug-ins** of the present invention **insert visual feedback** directly **into** the source **document** (for example, adding a dog-ear corner to the upper right page corner to show duplex printing, see FIG. 2), so any user interactions in the source document apply to the visual feedback as well. For example, as the user moves pages around in the document, the visual feedback moves with the page automatically. When the **visual cues are added** to the document, the plug-ins keep track of **the objects** to which they have added themselves and which were in the document originally. Preferably, the plug-ins add a hidden or unseen marker to the **visual cue objects**, but alternatively the plug-ins could keep a list of visual cue object IDs. When the **document is to be saved or printed**, the plug-ins search each page for visual cue **objects and remove** them, so that the saved or printed document does not include the cues. Also, when the visual cue objects are removed, the plug-ins locate any unseen markers that may have been previously inserted. For example, dog-ear corners are very useful when editing the job ticket in the application, but are not desirable in the printed output document. The job ticket parameters represented by the visual cues are stored or printed via the job ticket instead.

Paragraph 0013 (emphasis added). This clearly supports “inserting or removing visual cue objects from a file” and claims 5 and 13.

With regard to claims 6 and 14, the Office Action asserts that the specification “fails to describe creating a print job ticket when markers are removed.” Office Action, #7, page 3.

“The job originator then has all the advantages of the viewing application when ticketing the job,” paragraph 0005. “When the **document is to be saved or printed**, the plug-ins search each page for visual cue **objects and remove** them, so that the saved or **printed document does not include the cues.**” *Supra* (emphasis added). In this case, the job is ticketed when it is sent to print. “The job ticket parameters represented by the visual cues are stored or printed via the job ticket instead.” *Id.* So, when a job is sent to print, the markers are removed and applied by a job ticket. Further, the present “invention extend[s] the application’s user interface (for example, by adding new menu

items and dialogs) to let the user invoke job ticketing functions.” Paragraph 0018. Those new functions include creating a new ticket. Paragraph 0019. Therefore, the specification describes “creating a print job ticket when markers are removed” and claims 6 and 14. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 20 for failing the written description requirement under 35 USC §112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 9 are objected to for including informalities and claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite, specifically, for lacking antecedent basis for recitations in claims 1, 6 and 14. Responsive thereto, claims 1, 6, 9 and 14 are amended as suggested by the Office Action and to provide proper antecedent basis. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1 and 9 and the rejection of claims 1 – 20 under 35 USC §112 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 – 9 and 11 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,614,454 to Livingston in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,999,945 to Lahey et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,407,820 to Hansen. Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Livingston, Lahey et al. and Hansen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,880,124 to Moore. Claims 17 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Livingston, Lahey et al. and Hansen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,268,924 to Koppolu et al.

Livingston teaches a “method of **displaying** multiple printer options **in a graphical user interface** [that] includes dividing a viewing window into first and second portions separated by a first divider including a first visible affordance and displaying a scrollable list of features in the first portion together with a scroll bar.” Livingston, col. 1, lines 40 – 44 (emphasis added). So, the Livingston GUI divides a window in three. “The graphical user interface is configured to allow user selection and modification of print engine options for printing the document.” *Id*, col. 2, lines 19 – 21. Thus, a user interfaces through the Livingston GUI, which is not a document viewing application, to

modify a print document. As for the document image 68, “[t]he first sub portion 56 [from the GUI dividing the window] displays a print preview image 68 showing placement of the three staples 69.” *Id.*, col. 5, lines 48 – 49. Livingston is silent on what is being used to display the image. There is no reason to believe, however, that it is a standard document viewing application, such as Microsoft Word or Adobe Acrobat Exchange. Application, paragraph 0004 and 5. It is reasonably likely that, given it is within the Livingston GUI, that it is a proprietary viewer, e.g., customized to the GUI, as described in the present application. *See, e.g.*, paragraph 0003.

By contrast, the present invention “display[s] selected print job parameters and allow such parameters to be manipulated **from within** the application.” Paragraph 0004 (emphasis added). So essentially, where Livingston teaches a GUI providing the function and displaying the image, the present application teaches plug-ins to standard desktop publishing type software that enhances the publishing type software. Thus, with the plug-ins in the standard desktop publishing type software, “[t]he job originator then has all the advantages of the viewing application when ticketing the job, such as thumbnail drag-and-drop and other manipulations, ... [and] can use a familiar interface to view documents without having to learn a new application.” Paragraph 0005. This is quite different than Livingston and not taught or suggested by Lahey et al., Hansen, Moore or Koppolu et al.

Accordingly, claims 1 – 3 and 9 are amended to recite that the job ticketing activity is from “within the document viewing application,” which is neither taught nor suggested by Livingston, Lahey et al., Hansen, Moore or Koppolu et al. Further claim 2 is amended to recite that “document viewing application provides access to all features while the plug-ins are active in said document viewing application,” i.e., to reflect that the “job originator then has all the advantages of the viewing application when ticketing the job.” *Supra*. Neither is this taught or suggested by Livingston, Lahey et al., Hansen, Moore or Koppolu et al.

In addition, claim 17 is amended to recite that the document viewing application is a word processor. This is supported by the specification, i.e., “using a standard document viewing application, such as Adobe Acrobat Exchange, Microsoft **Word or others**, to display the document and the visual feedback cues,” paragraph 0005 (emphasis added). Neither is this taught or suggested by Livingston, Lahey et al., Hansen, Moore or Koppolu et al. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 20 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

The applicants thank the Examiner for efforts, both past and present, in examining the application. Believing the application to be in condition for allowance, both for the amendment to the claims and for the reasons set forth above, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 20 under 35 U.S.C. §§112 and 103(a) and allowance of the application to issue.

Should anything further be required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below for a telephonic or personal interview to discuss any other changes. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3669 and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully Submitted,

April 27, 2011
(Date)

/Charles W. Peterson, Jr., #34,406/
Charles W. Peterson, Jr.
Registration No. 34,406

Customer No. 56,989
Law Office of Charles W. Peterson, Jr.
12793 Thacker Hill Ct.
Suite 1B
Oak Hill, VA 20171
Telephone: (703) 481-0532
Facsimile: (703) 481-0585